

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK

-----X

JEFFREY LLOYD et al.,

Plaintiffs,

-v-

11- CV-9305-LTS-HBP

J.P. MORGAN CHASE & CO. et al.,

Defendants.

-----X

ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION

Defendants in the above-captioned action move, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1292(b), for certification to file an interlocutory appeal from the Court’s December 19, 2013 Order (docket entry no. 143), which overruled objections to Judge Pitman’s October 29, 2013 Order (“October 29 Order”) (docket entry no. 127). At issue is whether Judge Pitman’s October 29 Order, which requires Defendants to provide notice to individuals who might have a right to join this action, should stand. On April 1, 2014, Magistrate Judge Pitman issued a Report and Recommendation (“Report”) recommending that the Court deny the Defendants’ motion. Defendants filed no objections.

When reviewing a magistrate judge’s report and recommendation, the district court “may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge.” 28 U.S.C.S. § 636(b)(1)(C) (LexisNexis 2012). “To accept the report and recommendation of a magistrate, to which no timely objection has been made, a district court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record.” Wilds v. United States Parcel Service, Inc., 262 F. Supp. 2d 163, 169 (S.D.N.Y. 2003) (internal citations and

quotation marks omitted).

The Court has considered carefully the issues raised in connection with Defendants' motion. It has also reviewed Judge Pitman's thorough and well-reasoned Report. The Court finds that the Report contains no clear error and adopts the Report in its entirety. Defendants' motion is accordingly denied.

This Order resolves docket entry no. 150.

SO ORDERED.

Dated: New York, New York  
July 16, 2014

/s/  
LAURA TAYLOR SWAIN  
United States District Judge